Ham-Policy Digest   Wed, 17 Aug 94   Volume 94 : Issue 377

Today's Topics:
                        CW ...IS NOW! (2 msgs)
                              CW VIEWS
                          Reply to Brenda
                          Scanner Freedom
                Slow Code Idea by Wayne Green (2 msgs)
                        Worthless media slugs

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 16 Aug 1994 13:14:28 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
cs.utk.edu!stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ...IS NOW!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <32och4$cbb@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@Eng.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

>>Why are you still providing an automated weather product?

>Could it be because the USCG hasn't gone to the trouble of ceasing it yet?

>What is your point, anyway?

The point is, as "The Big Kahuna" has often stated, CW is not dead by a long
shot. The weather advisories are probably intended for ships on the high
seas. From time to time Old Sol can render satellites useless. Storms can

also damage the ship's gear so there needs to be a backup. Also, not all
commercial enterprises can afford the latest satellite gear.

Last winter, I handled H & W CW traffic for the ship's radio operator on an
oil tanker in the persian gulf. He had relatives in the town next to me, and
it was a real treat to handle the third party traffic. You could tell he was
excited to be able to let them know that he was all right after weeks at
sea and to get a report on their situation. It sort of gives you a warm fuzzy
feeling that you have done your good deed for the day and that all of the
effort in learning the code and earning the HF license was really worth it.
We chatted a while, and he explained that he was taking a break from
transmitting the oil tanker's company traffic and had decided to check the 15M
ham band.

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov
==
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =
==

Date: 16 Aug 1994 14:23:32 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!koriel!
newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW ...IS NOW!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 2E50BBB4@ornl.gov, wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX) writes:
>In article <32och4$cbb@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@Eng.Sun.COM (Dana Myers)
writes:
>
>>>Why are you still providing an automated weather product?
>
>>Could it be because the USCG hasn't gone to the trouble of ceasing it yet?
>
>>What is your point, anyway?
>
>The point is, as "The Big Kahuna" has often stated, CW is not dead by a long
>shot. The weather advisories are probably intended for ships on the high
>seas. From time to time Old Sol can render satellites useless. Storms can

>also damage the ship's gear so there needs to be a backup. Also, not all
>commercial enterprises can afford the latest satellite gear.

The weather advisories are probably a service that has been provided by the
USCG for a long time, and haven't been phased out.... yet.

Certainly, there are conditions when satellite services are not usable.
I wonder how often this really is?

Storm damage to ship's gear? Why would this selectively knock out everything
but a CW transmitter? Why wouldn't it be as likely to knock out HF CW gear
as it is to damage HF SSB or satellite gear?

Citing "The Big Kahuna" doesn't lend any credibility to your point, by the way.

>Last winter, I handled H & W CW traffic for the ship's radio operator on an
>oil tanker in the persian gulf. He had relatives in the town next to me, and
>it was a real treat to handle the third party traffic. You could tell he was
>excited to be able to let them know that he was all right after weeks at
>sea and to get a report on their situation. It sort of gives you a warm fuzzy
>feeling that you have done your good deed for the day and that all of the
>effort in learning the code and earning the HF license was really worth it.
>We chatted a while, and he explained that he was taking a break from
>transmitting the oil tanker's company traffic and had decided to check the 15M
>ham band.

If it gives you a warm fuzzy to learn the code, that's really neat. However,
the demand for a reserve of trained CW operators has all but completely vanished.
Continuing to require knowledge of CW in the amateur service doesn't make
sense any more. People who want to learn CW will, and those who want to use
it will continue to use it (I know I will). But requiring everyone to learn
CW simply to gain access to HF doesn't make sense longer.

---
 * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are
     *
 * (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily   *
 * Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
     *
 * "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"   *

Date: Mon, 15 Aug 1994 14:46:28 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!nntp.msstate.edu!emory!
cs.utk.edu!stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW VIEWS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <32h2q9$7ev@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@Eng.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

>In article 2E479881@ornl.gov, wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:
>>In article <3261c0$qhv@chnews.intel.com> Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:
>>ue to
>>>be free to use CW and so will I. "We" will simply be free of the present
>>>use of governmental force or threat of force to cram CW down "our" throats.
>>
>>No one is cramming CW down "your" throats. There are gigahertz of frequencies
>>to access without demonstrating competency in Morse code. If "we" are so
>>noble to want to stop the government from being an advocacy for any mode,
>>let's campaign against the current NPRM to assign 132 KHz of HF spectrum to
>>automatic packet data stations. The failure to do the latter brings into
>>serious question the former.

>As a quick reality check, Clay is apparently confused. The government is
>is relaxing the restrictions against automated digital modes, allowing it
>to be used in some band segments on HF.

You are correct in that the Commission used the word "authorize" in their
PR. They also point out they are proposing this in response to ARRL and
ADRS petitions who certainly did "advocate" this authorization.

By the same logic one can conclude that the FCC does not favor or advocate
Morse coded CW, it just authorizes its use on all HF frequencies. In other
words the FCC has a blanket prohibition against all modes and operating means
(active control, remote control, semi-automatic, automatic, etc.) unless
specifically authorized. It appears then that the FCC has never promoted or
favorably selected or advocated any mode, just authorized or not authorized.

73,
Clay
N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov
===
=   ...- .. ...- .-   - . .-.. . --. .-. .- .--. .... -.--   =
===

Date: 16 Aug 94 15:03:31 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Reply to Brenda

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>I just heard about Amatuer Radio from a friend who is also beginning
>to learn about Amatuer Radio. It sounds really interesting to me and
>I would like to learn more details about this. Are there any
>magazines and books for Amateur radio? Or any FTP sites where I
>could download files
>about Amatuer Radio?

>I am interested in learning those codes and if you know where I can
>register for the class, do let me know. I live in Columbus, Ohio.

>Thanks very much! :)

>Brenda

Brenda:

    The first thing to do when you post to a mail group is to add your
e-mail address on the end so we can send stuff directly to you. Your
exact e-mail address gets ripped off of what we see.

    Now to your questions. I am glad you are interested, and there are
many of us who will be glad to help you get started.

    Magazines: (available at some big news stands probably also at
Ohio State library)

    QST   the publication of our "association", technical stuff,
            getting started stuff, club type info
    CQ   aimed primarily at public service and operating kinds of
            stuff
    Communications Quarterly aimed at high tech EE types

    73   a good beginners magazine (but you might want to ignore
            Wayne Green's editorials. He is a "character".)

    Books available from ARRL:

    "Now you're talking" an intro to amateur radio
    "operating an Amateur Radio Station" for once you have a license

Again, you might find these at the college library, but maybe not.
If you are really interested, I am sure someone can get you a copy, or
you can order them from ARRL at (203) 666- 1541 or

ARRL
                225 Main St
                Newington, CT 06111

    One additional comment I would make. There is a lot of heated
    discussion going on in this news group. Please don't take the tone of
    these discussions as representative of all of amateur radio!

    There are ftp sites also. I am sure if you read this group again
    someone who knows better than I where the FAQ (frequently asked
    questions) area is. There is a server ftp.cs.buffalo.edu . Look in
    /pub/ham-radio.

    If you need any questions answered you can ask me directly:

    Ray Mack
    WD5IFS
    mack@mails.imed.com

Date: 16 Aug 94 19:02:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Scanner Freedom
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

What about all of us who have one of the newer handy-talkies that
will "scan?" Will those be classified as scanners? Will those be
banned? What about those of us who have one of the Yaesu
VHF/UHF scanning receivers? Will those also be banned?

Kevin

Legal stuff:
The above opinions are my own and not necessarily those of the staff,
faculty, administration, or lab animals (woof!) of The University of
Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio or anyone else who is not
me.

Kevin R. Muenzler, WB5RUE   The University of Texas Health
muenzlerk@uthscsa.edu   Science Center at San Antonio,
                                     Department of Computing Resources

```
        ** There is no such thing as a Monkey-Proof Program! **
        **                  I can prove it!                   **
 ----------------------------------------------------------------------


------------------------------

Date: Mon, 15 Aug 1994 07:41:28
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!udel!news.sprintlink.net!
indirect.com!s146.phxslip.indirect.com!lenwink@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Slow Code Idea by Wayne Green
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

On the 8/14/94 edition of Ham Radio & More, Wayne Green, Publisher of 73
Magazine said that there should be only 1 license for amateur radio allowing
you all priviledges. It should require 5 wpm code knowledge and be more
technical than today's tests. What do you think?

73, Len, KB7LPW

------------------------------

Date: Mon, 15 Aug 1994 14:53:29 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!cs.utk.edu!
stc06.CTD.ORNL.GOV!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Slow Code Idea by Wayne Green
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <lenwink.173.0007B12B@indirect.com> lenwink@indirect.com (Len Winkler)
writes:

>On the 8/14/94 edition of Ham Radio & More, Wayne Green, Publisher of 73
>Magazine said that there should be only 1 license for amateur radio allowing
>you all priviledges. It should require 5 wpm code knowledge and be more
>technical than today's tests. What do you think?

>73, Len, KB7LPW

I was wondering where some of the strange ideas were coming from.  Now I
know!  Thanks for the very enlightening post.

73,
Clay
N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov
=========================================================================
=       ...-  .. ...-  .-   - . .-.. . --- .-. .- .--. .... -.--        =
=========================================================================
```

Date: 15 Aug 1994 19:18:56 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!mvb.saic.com!bethel.connected.com!
hebron.connected.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Worthless media slugs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <32ld0h$kok@nic-nac.CSU.net>,
Berton Corson <g9153402@huey.csun.edu> wrote:
>If any sort of huge scanner ban
>is ever enacted, you would probably hear huge screams from the media
>(TV, radio, newspapers) who are big-time scanner users in finding and
>reporting news stories.

        I doubt it! The media would be sure that some nice little
exemption was carved out for themselves before any such ban is enacted.
I've often felt that the relvant non-disclosure, non-use for persoanl or
business purposes prohibitions in teh Communications Act of 1934 should
be applied to any news medai gathering effort just as it would be to
anyone else using and profiting from the same. The dominant media culture
assumes that it is above the law and the rules do not apply to them!

--
 ===
 + Dan Morisseau, N7ZXL| I root for 2 teams - The St. Louis Cardinals ...+
 +   Auburn, WA | and whoever is playing against the New York Mets! +
 + GEnie:D.MORISSEAU | INTERNET ADDRESS: danm@connected.com   +

Date: Tue, 16 Aug 1994 03:40:34 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!uhog.mit.edu!news.kei.com!eff!wariat.org!malgudi.oar.net!
witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <32b5vi$n3f@hacgate2.hac.com>, <081194182202Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<CuJywr.LGn@world.std.com><1994Aug15.110241.1@aspen.uml.edu>ch
Reply-To : mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)
Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

In article <1994Aug15.110241.1@aspen.uml.edu>, martinja@aspen.uml.edu
(martinja@aspen.uml.edu) writes:

>In article <CuJywr.LGn@world.std.com>, drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker)
>wrote:
>
>[snippeth, snippeth]
>
>> The trick is making sure you really have control.
>
>Seems to me that if the control op had the capability to remotely stop the
>operation of the radio being used by the non-ham the operation could be
>legal. DTMF control or whatever.   BEEEEEEP!--Other radio shuts down.
>
What happens if he walks out of range?

Mike, KK6GM

Date: Tue, 16 Aug 1994 14:15:28 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!rogjd@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <081394044254Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <32kukf$i9h@oak.oakland.edu>,
<4yDqwzmIhqX81Vol06a@msen.com>nasa.
Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

Vince Vielhaber (vev@msen.com) wrote:

SNIP!

: And Roger said >

:   I can think of a zillion things I'd rather
:   have the FCC focus on. (Straightening out the digital sub bands, for
:   instance.)

: Why the hell do you want to go and get the government involved in the
: digital sub-bands for anyway. Don't you think they've done enough for
: the 220 band? Not to mention the Wind Profiler on 440.

Hell, hey? Gee folks sure do get emotional here on the old information
highway!   :-)

If you were cognizant of the recent current events relating to the
digital bands, you'd know the answer. Feel free to e-mail me if you
like. (But calm down first....)

```
:-)




--
                                          rogjd@netcom.com
                                          Glendale, CA
                                          AB6WR


-----------------------------

Date: Tue, 16 Aug 1994 14:12:29 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!rogjd@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <329ivd$m3s@oak.oakland.edu>, <rogjdCuKrr7.3w4@netcom.com>,
<32no2c$fum@oak.oakland.edu>
Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

prvalko (prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu) wrote:
: Roger Buffington (rogjd@netcom.com) wrote:

: : I think your idea is a poor one.  In my opinion it addresses a
: : non-problem anyway.  The circumstances you outline are not common.  Right
: : now, FCC administrative time/resources must be viewed as a SCARCE
: : resource for amateur radio.  I can think of a zillion things I'd rather
: : have the FCC focus on. (Straightening out the digital sub bands, for
: : instance.)

: IMHO, the digital sub-band is a non-problem, because I don't use 'em,
: same reason you think that the proposal I outlined is a non-issue, you
: believe it is an uncommon situation, yet I KNOW I can't go a week
: without the thought hitting me and saying... I SHOULD be able to do
: that.

Well, to each his own.  On the other hand, the oddball scenarios you
outline in order to justify your silly proposal apply to virtually no one
99.9% of the time.  On the other hand, there are hams operating digital
24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

: : I also hate the idea of non-hams on the bands, on principle.

: How do you live with yourself when ayou tune 20M and hear all the
: phone patch activities... not to mention the autopatch on the repeater?
: Non hams are on the bands (under control ops, same as my proposal) today.
```

"How do I live with myself...." Well, for one, I justify my existance on
earth partly by making a crusade out of shooting down silly ideas like
yours, old chap.

You will note that the replies to your "idea" (if that's what it is) have
been uniformly negative.

73

--

                                        rogjd@netcom.com
                                        Glendale, CA
                                        AB6WR

Date: Tue, 16 Aug 1994 22:24:47 GMT
From: news.mtholyoke.edu!world!drt@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <081394044254Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <32kukf$i9h@oak.oakland.edu>,
<4yDqwzmIhqX81Vol06a@msen.com>
Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

Vince Vielhaber (vev@msen.com) wrote:

: Then Dave Tucker said >

:   I'm inclined to think that if each transmitter had a control operator
:   who insured compliance with the rules, whether a third party talked
:   into a hand microphone, or an HT mic, or a telephone mic, would be
:   irrelevant. The trick is making sure you really have control.

: Here is where I have the biggest problem. No matter whose license is at
: stake, everyone does *not* have equipment that can be *controlled* remotely.
: I can see it now: I'm about a half-a-mile ahead of my non ham friend.
: Suddenly during our conversation he spouts, "Hey, that asshole just cut me
: off!" or "Hey, there's that song I was telling you about <keeps the
: transmitter keyed and sticks the mic/ht in front of the speaker>". About
: that time I slam on my brakes and ...

You can have this same problem when you're there in person, of course.
What can you do but explain the ground rules before things get
rolling, and tell him to stop if he makes a mistake? Of course, he
has to be reliable. You're betting your license on it. I can see why
you might not want to!

: Why the hell do you want to go and get the government involved in the

: digital sub-bands for anyway. Don't you think they've done enough for
: the 220 band? Not to mention the Wind Profiler on 440.

I have to agree with this. The Canadian government got out of the
subband business, and the FCC should, too. There's no reason 80-10
can't be governed by bandplans like the rest of our spectrum. We can
manage. Let's find a voluntary place for digital stuff, if we have
to, the way we voluntarily find a place for 160 CW or 440 repeaters.
The system's more flexible and less bureaucratic.

-drt

|David R. Tucker   KG2S   8P9CL   drt@world.std.com|

Date: 16 Aug 94 13:52:47 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!
aspen.uml.edu!martinja@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <081194182202Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<CuJywr.LGn@world.std.com><1994Aug15.110241.1@aspen.uml.edu>, <492@ted.win.net>
Subject : Re: Let's kick this idea around...

In article <492@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:
>
>>In article <1994Aug15.110241.1@aspen.uml.edu: I wrote:
>>>In article <CuJywr.LGn@world.std.com>, drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker)
>>>wrote:

Me:
>>[snippeth, snippeth]

David:
>>> The trick is making sure you really have control.

Me:
>>Seems to me that if the control op had the capability to remotely stop the
>>operation of the radio being used by the non-ham the operation could be
>>legal. DTMF control or whatever.   BEEEEEEP!--Other radio shuts down.

Mike:
> What happens if he walks out of range?
              ^^
I reply:

Good question Mike. :(The same thing that would happen if a stray arrow killed
the control op dead as a nail as he stood holding his HT ready to hit the
correct sequence of DTMF tones to shut the remote off....absolutely nothing!

One of the stipulations is that the remote has to be within range. If it's
not, then it can't be controlled and wouldn't be legal.

By the Way..."IF" a frog had wings it wouldn't bump its ass when jumping...:)

I mean geez Mike, what IF someone pushed *THE* Button and blew up the whole
world? We wouldn't have to worry about a thing then, huh?

What if more people knew about and used a little common sense?

73 de WK1V
  -jim-